

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of February 5, 2005.

Applicants request re-examination and reconsideration of the present application.

#### **The Office Action**

Claims 1 and 3-45 were presented for examination. By this amendment, Applicants amend claim 1, cancel claim 7, cancel claims 29-45, and add new claims 46-48.

All claims previously presented stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Takehashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,142,192 and Yano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,699,596).

#### **Telephone Interview of March 5, 2008**

Applicants acknowledge the Telephone Interview of March 5, 2008 regarding this application. Applicants provided arguments to the Examiner, which the Examiner discussed with a Supervisor. From a telephone conversation following that interview, it appeared to be the Examiner's position, along with the Supervisor, that Applicants had not shown new and unexpected results related to language of the claims, and therefore the claims were not allowed.

#### **Remaining Claims Are Distinguished From the Cited Art**

Having reviewed the Examiner's position, and the art, Applicants further amend independent claim 1 to more particularly recite the concept of having fluorine from the fluoride-containing layer to be partially infused into the phosphor thin film layer. This structure results in the fluoride layer and the phosphor layer forming the phosphor laminate.

It is submitted none of the prior art teach or fairly suggest this concept. A benefit found by the concept is a more unified structure than shown in the prior art, and one which performs with improved capabilities as compared to the prior art.

Particularly, the structure described above can be annealed at temperatures lower than those previously possible, while at the same time generating performance required to compete with high level CRTs for television applications and other high

quality displays. Previously, such high quality devices were processed at temperatures higher than those of the present application, as claimed in the dependent claims, in order to achieve acceptable luminosity under feasible operating conditions.

For at least the above-cited reasons, it is submitted claim 1 as presented is distinguished over the cited art.

As dependent claims 3-6 and 8-28 depend from and further define distinguished claim 1, it is submitted they are also distinguished.

To further emphasize the distinctions between the concepts of the present application and the cited art, Applicants have drafted new claims 46-48.

Independent claim 46 defines an electroluminescent display similar to that as described in the present application and previous claim 1, specifically reciting that the display includes a phosphor laminate, including a blue light emitting phosphor thin film, along with a fluoride containing layer provided directly adjacent and in contact with the phosphor layer. This claim again more particularly recites that the phosphor thin film layer and the fluoride containing layer are configured such that the fluorine from the fluoride containing layer is partially infused into the phosphor thin film layer, producing a phosphor laminate, which improves the overall structure and operability of the claimed electroluminescent display.

In addition, dependent claim 47 specifically recites the phosphor layer as being barium thioluminate activated with europium. Further noted is that the thin film dielectric layer consists of barium titanate and the fluoride layer is comprised of aluminum fluoride. It is respectfully submitted a device constructed according to such materials is not taught or fairly recited in the applied art.

Still further, dependent claim 48 describes device constructed according to claims 46 and 47 is configured to have a luminance of about 200 candelas per square meter at about 60 volts above a threshold voltage of about 120 volts.

With attention to these claims, in Applicants application, examples of devices constructed according to the teachings of the present application are described in detail. It is particularly noted that devices which do not include the aluminum fluoride layer will have a higher threshold voltage than those constructed according to the teachings of the present application.

The lower threshold voltage is advantageous in that either the display operative voltage can be lowered in order to lower the power consumption of the device, or the phosphor thickness can be increased to increase the threshold voltage to that of the prior art devices, with an expectation of increased luminance. It is considered a device as claimed in claim 48 having the threshold voltage and luminance set forth in that claim is not taught or suggested by the cited art.

For the above-noted reasons, it is therefore considered claims 46-48 are distinguished over the cited art.

Applicants have made the above amendments in order to move prosecution of the application forward. However, as Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's arguments and positions in the previous Office Actions, and in the telephone interviews, they also reserve the right to further their arguments at the appropriate time.